



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/682,211

10/08/2003

Tomohiro Suzuki

03610/LH

8091

1933 7590 08/08/2007

FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC

220 Fifth Avenue

16TH Floor

NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708

EXAMINER

PACHOL, NICHOLAS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2609

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/08/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/682,211

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas C. Pachol

Art Unit

2609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date AL

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 13, 16, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maniwa (US 5,933,584).

Regarding Claim 13, Maniwa teaches a network system for processing image data (Column 2, lines 36-40), comprising:

an image-processing apparatus including an image-reading section to read an image from a document (Figure 3, elements 107 and 113);

an image-printing apparatus including an image-printing section to print an image on a sheet (Figure 2, elements 106 and 112); and

an information processing apparatus coupled to both said image-processing apparatus and said image-printing apparatus through a network (Figure 5, element 501);

wherein said image-processing apparatus or said image-printing apparatus further includes:

a provided function setting section to set a functional restriction for restricting a function to be provided for said information processing apparatus (Column 10, lines 10-17).

Regarding Claims 16, Maniwa teaches wherein said plurality of information processing apparatus includes a computer or a personal computer (Column 10, lines 5-7).

Regarding Claim 17, Maniwa teaches a network system for processing image data (Column 2, lines 36-40), comprising:

an image-processing apparatus including an image-reading section to read an image from a document (Figure 3, elements 107 and 113;)

an image-printing apparatus including an image-printing section to print an image on a sheet (Figure 2, elements 106 and 112);

and an information processing apparatus (reads on a node coupled to the trunk line in figure 5 and Column 10, lines 5-8) coupled to both said image-processing apparatus and said image-printing apparatus through a network; (Column 1, lines 17-21 and Figure 5)

wherein said image-processing apparatus or said image-printing apparatus further includes: a server section that serves as a server for apparatus on said network (Figure 5, element 501).

Regarding Claim 19, Maniwa teaches wherein said information processing apparatus is a computer or a personal computer (Maniwa Column 10, lines 5-7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Maniwa (US 5,933,584) in view of Lee (US 6,728,001).

Regarding Claim 1, Maniwa teaches a network system for processing image data (Column 2, lines 36-40), comprising:

an image-processing apparatus including an image-reading section to read an image from a document (Figure 3, elements 107 and 113);

an image-printing apparatus including an image-printing section to print an image on a sheet (Figure 2, elements 106 and 112);

a plurality of networks including a first network and a second network; (Figures 2 and 3, where both networks are independent)

and a plurality of information processing apparatus including a first information processing apparatus coupled to said first network and a second

information processing apparatus coupled to said second network;(Column 1, lines 17-21 and Figures 2 and 3, both networks are independent).

The limitation of wherein said image-processing apparatus further includes: a routing section to conduct a routing operation between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus reads on Maniwa's router as disclosed (Column 10, lines 25-32, and Column 22, line 50 – Column 23, line 15).

However, if the applicant disagrees with the examiner's above ascertain then, Lee does teach wherein said image-processing apparatus further includes: a routing section to conduct a routing operation between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus (Column 1, lines 30-49) therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa with the teachings of Lee for the purpose of being able to share the apparatus amongst the network (Column 1, lines 41-45).

Regarding Claim 2, Maniwa further teaches wherein said image-processing apparatus further includes:

a first network I/F section, through which said image-processing apparatus is coupled to said first network (Figure 2 element 112 though the server 106); and

a second network I/F section, through which said image-processing apparatus is coupled to said second network (Figure 3 element 113 though server 107).

Regarding Claim 3, Maniwa further teaches wherein said image-printing apparatus is coupled to either said image-processing apparatus or anyone of said plurality of networks (Figure 4, element 101).

Regarding Claim 6, Maniwa further teaches wherein said plurality of information processing apparatus includes a computer or a personal computer. (Column 10, lines 5-7)

5. Claims 7-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maniwa in view of Lee.

Regarding Claim 7, Maniwa teaches a network system for processing image data (Column 2, lines 36-40), comprising:

an image-processing apparatus including an image-reading section to read an image from a document (Figure 3, elements 107 and 113);

an image-printing apparatus including an image-printing section to print an image on a sheet (Figure 2, elements 106 and 112);

a plurality of networks including a first network and a second network; (Figures 2 and 3, where both networks are independent)

and a plurality of information processing apparatus including a first information processing apparatus coupled to said first network and a second information processing

apparatus coupled to said second network; (Column 1, lines 17-21 and Figures 2 and 3, both networks are independent)

However Maniwa does not teach wherein said image-printing apparatus further includes: a routing section to conduct a routing operation between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus.

Lee does teach wherein said image-printing apparatus further includes: a routing section to conduct a routing operation between said first information processing apparatus and said second information processing apparatus (Column 1, lines 30-49) therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa with the teachings of Lee for the purpose of being able to share the apparatus amongst the network (Column 1, lines 41-45).

Regarding Claim 8, Maniwa further teaches wherein said image-printing apparatus further includes:

a first network I/F section, through which said image-printing apparatus is coupled to said first network (Column 11, Lines 12-18); and

a second network I/F section, through which said image-printing apparatus is coupled to said second network (Column 11, lines 12-18).

Regarding Claim 9, Maniwa further teaches wherein said image-processing apparatus is coupled to either said image-printing apparatus or anyone of said plurality of networks (Figure 3, element 101).

Regarding Claim 12, Maniwa further teaches wherein said plurality of information processing apparatus includes a computer or a personal computer (Column 10, lines 5-7).

6. Claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maniwa in view of Lee further in view of Sakellaropoulos (US 5,790,279).

Regarding Claims 4 and 10, Maniwa in view of Lee does not teach an image-processing apparatus and image printing apparatus into a single apparatus.

Sakellaropoulos does teach an image-processing apparatus and image printing apparatus into a single apparatus (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 54-66) therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus(Column 1, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claims 5 and 11, Sakellaropoulos further teaches a single apparatus as described in claims 4 and 10 that has copier functions (column 1 lines 48-51 and 54-66).

7. Claims 4, 5, 14, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maniwa in view of Sakellaropoulos.

Regarding Claim 4, Maniwa does not teach an image-processing apparatus and image printing apparatus into a single apparatus.

Sakellaropoulos does teach an image-processing apparatus and image printing apparatus into a single apparatus (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 54-66) therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus(Column 1, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claim 14, Maniwa does not teach an image-processing apparatus and image printing apparatus into a single apparatus. Sakellaropoulos does teach an image-processing apparatus and image printing apparatus into a single apparatus (Figure 1 and column 1, lines 54-66) therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Maniwa with the teachings of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of having one single apparatus (Column 1, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claims 5 and 15, Sakellaropoulos further teaches a single apparatus as described in claims 4 and 14 that has copier functions (column 1 lines 48-51 and 54-66).

Regarding Claim 18, Maniwa does not teach wherein said image-processing apparatus and said image-printing apparatus are integrated into a single apparatus; and wherein said single apparatus is a digital copier including said server section.

Sakellaropoulos does teach said image-processing apparatus and said image-printing apparatus are integrated into a single apparatus; and wherein said single apparatus is a digital copier including said server section (column 1 lines 48-51 and 54-66) therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Maniwa with the teaching of Sakellaropoulos for the purpose of being able to have copier functions on the single apparatus (Column 1, lines 60-64).

8. Claim 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maniwa

Regarding Claim 20, Maniwa does not teach wherein said server section is anyone of a web server, a mail server and a database server.

Official Notice is taken that it is well known that a server can configured to be a web server, a mail server and a database server therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of a server in Maniwa to be a web server, a mail server and a database server

Art Unit: 2609

for the purpose of consolidating many functions of those of a web server, a mail server and a database server into a single server for simplifying the management of the system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F , Alternate Friday off, 7:30 a.m.-5 p.m. (Est).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7305. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


HAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER